DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 485 CS 001 279

AUTHOR Griffin, Margaret M.; Brousseau, Paula J.
TITLE Using Evaluation to Identify "Good" Teachers of Reading.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (19th, New Orleans, Louisiana, May 1-4, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Curriculum Development; *Effective Teaching; Reading; Reading Improvement; Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; *Reading Research; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a 3-year project conducted at two universities and aimed at providing an ongoing evaluation of teachers of reading. The contents include a review of the literature on teaching behaviors in reading; a theoretical concept of evaluation within which the program operates; seven theoretical questions which look at a definition of good teachers of reading; limitations of the project; alternatives such as team teaching, graduate practicum, and students being tutored in reading; information on student and faculty needs from the definitions of teachers of reading; a plan for the collection of data, results, and use of information; an example of one procedure for implementation; and the results so far of one project in evolving the behaviors of good teachers of reading. (WR)

ED 095485

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Using Evaluation to Identify "Good" Teachers of Reading

Margaret M. Griffin and Paula J. Brousseau

*Margaret M. Griffin
Institute for Child Study
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Paula J. Brousseau
Horace Mann Learning Center
Northwest Missouri State University
Maryville, Missouri 64468

*Additional copies of the paper may be obtained at this address.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Margaret M. Griffin
Paula J. Brousseau
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

International Reading Association
19th Annual Convention
New Orleans, Louisiana
May 4, 1974

CS 001 379

Using Evaluation to Identify "Good" Teachers of Reading

Margaret M. Griffin and Paula J. Brousseau

We think it can be assumed from research completed in the 1950's and 1960's that the creative teacher is the essential element in a successful program. All else - reading, organizational and evaluative procedures which include materials - serve only a supportive role to a "good" teacher (11, 12, 3, 2). Our problem has been and still is, much to our dismay, what is a "good" teacher of reading or what are "good" teachers of reading? We believe that just as there is not one best method for teaching reading there cannot be one "good" teacher of reading.

Much research has been completed on teacher behaviors (7, 1, 13) but little has been completed on teacher behaviors for a more effective teacher of reading (2, 5). These studies on teacher behavior are concerned only indirectly with the product of teaching, that is, changes in pupil behavior or with the cognitive aspects of learning. It is not until we have seen the results of teacher characteristics or interaction or behavior in reading and the teaching of reading on pupil development in reading that we will have something we can use in teacher education. Artley (2) in his distinguished leaders address at the Kansas City Convention, 1969, suggested from a friend's description, that a good teacher contains the same characteristics of a good bar girl. She is cooperative, sympathetic, poised, well-groomed, healthy, imaginative, gets along well with her co-workers and her principal, and

gets her reports in on time. However, how does she perform in the teaching of reading? Past studies have told us little that we can put into the context of reading or that gives us helpful clues to planning programs for teacher education in reading.

Della-Piana and Endo (5), in their recent chapter on "Reading Research", in Traver's (15) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, devote barely two pages (914-915) to teacher training in reading. They state that there is much about the results of what has been "done to" children in the name of 'reading research' but little on the training of a more effective teacher of reading. Most of the latest research in the document is dated 1971, but what is stated about teacher training reflects training a teacher to be a "teacher manager" of a prescribed program, e.g. IPI, Individually Prescribed Instruction, etc.

This brings us to one of the most recent longitudinal studies which will be published soon in seven volumes, of which two are now out, The Power of Change and Individualization: The Way to Do It (8, 9). This five-year study by Goodlad and his colleagues was concerned with the process of change in elementary schools that were attempting to improve in a variety of ways. In the 1950's and 1960's our innovative programs consisted of the following:

1. Development outside the school
2. Introduction into the classroom
3. Indoctrination workshops for teachers
4. Method and technological adaptation by teachers
5. Instant reform
6. Development of "teacher proof" curricula that attempted to bypass completely the competencies of the great majority of teachers
7. Spotty change

From Goodlad's study, the new view for the future is as follows:

1. Predetermined change should not be imposed on the school.
2. Provide a structure within which each school is helped to bring about the changes it wants to effect.
3. The single school (staff, students, parents, facilities) is the most strategic unit in which to develop improved schooling.
4. The principal is the key agent for change in his/her school creating the climate in which effective change can take place. He/she must become the cooperative leader of a team rather than the traditional authority figure.
5. Some mechanism must be provided to help individual schools define their needs and to offer them support to attain them.

Goodlad believes that the heart of the program focuses of the teacher. He feels that there is a nucleus of teachers profoundly concerned with improving the educational process, hungry for ideas and eager to learn. But they cannot go it alone. Therefore, the principal is the key agent for change and becomes the crucial factor in successful innovation. A long term (3-5 years) supportive process where the environment supports and releases the natural creativity of a high proportion of the teachers is a reasonable time within which to expect achievement of productive and more permanent change within a school.

James Cass (4), education editor of Saturday Review/World indicates that education is the third most authoritarian profession in society outranked by the armed services and the police! If this is the case, then education fosters an environment that does not encourage independent thinkers or creative individuals, nor can it welcome fundamental change in the schools. With all of our efforts in the 50's and 60's, little change has taken place. Change has been seriously underestimated, but we think we have learned by our efforts and growth is possible. Turner (16, 17) who has done much research in teacher behavior as well as teacher behavior in reading, in his Overview of Research in Teacher

Education, states that present institutions of higher education have spent most of their time on training a teacher within the institutional environment without enough attention given to preselection criteria, placement, and particularly what he calls work success - namely, how does our teacher product work successfully in reading after a degree or certificate is completed?

Denemark and Yff (6) in their Final Report of the Higher Education Task Force on Improvement and Reform in American Education (AACTE) believe that institutions of higher education must become much more in public view - appearing less autonomous and more open to the needs and activities of the community. Reward mechanisms that enhance involvement of college faculites in community service must be completed and integration of practice and theory in teaching and learning should be done.

This leads us to the topic of this paper, "Using Evaluation to Identify 'Good' Teachers of Reading". Evaluation has been avoided in studies in this area chiefly for the reason that it is difficult to measure and has dealt mostly in personality in the past. However, this will never lead us to what seem to be more effective behaviors of "good" teachers of reading.

For the past three years, we (10) have been engaged in ongoing evaluation of teachers of reading at two universities with some of the ideas Goodlad is suggesting for the future. We believe it is worthy of sharing with you - particularly the process, though we will give results. But the results we give are from one team of individuals or one individual implementing a program in each institution. The process we will explain is applicable to each one of you for implementation in your unique

situation. This is what future reform in education is saying to us. So, we think we have a beginning, though, as Turner so indicates, our main lack is in follow-through of our students over a long period of time; and as Goodlad notes - it has not been completed in an individual school setting. However, it can, and we hope you try it to identify what you think to be "good" teachers of reading over a long period of time.

The rest of this paper deals with the following four areas: 1) a theoretical concept of evaluation within which we operate, (10); 2) seven theoretical questions we ask of ourselves; 3) an example of one procedure for implementation; and 4) the results so far of one project in evolving the behaviors of "good" teachers of reading.

Theoretical Concept of Evaluation

The theoretical concept presented is one that is ongoing and cyclical in nature and very process oriented to meet individual needs. To us evaluation is the collection of information as a guide in making instructional decisions in reading (14). It is the act of valuing. With that in mind what you as an individual value (believe) or what we as a team value or believe is vital to the development, implementation and evaluation of teachers of reading.

Because of this a team of faculty members and students (four in all) asked themselves the following seven questions and developed procedures for implementation to answer the questions to try to evolve specific behaviors teachers need in the teaching of reading. The seven questions are basic theoretical requirements which anyone may ask. The procedures for implementation vary with each team or individual.

Therefore, we are more interested in you utilizing the questions than the procedures we used.

Seven Theoretical Questions	Procedures for Implementation
1. What might be more effective or "good" teachers of reading?	The team defined a teacher of reading and considered three major areas; 1) needed teacher behaviors in reading; 2) needed teachers who are decision makers, thinkers, question askers; and 3) teachers who are knowledgeable about reading and the teaching of reading.
2. What are our limits? Reality?	The team's knowledge of the teaching of reading and the reading process. Students' experiential background in the same in a graduate practicum in the teaching of reading at Indiana University.
3. What alternatives are open to us?	Team, graduate practicum, students being tutored in reading.
4. What information do we need to collect?	Student and faculty feedback on needs from our definitions of teachers of reading and the three areas within it.
5. How and when do we plan to collect the information?	At midsemester we planned to receive student and team feedback on our definition and three areas. We planned to take these data and formulate specific behaviors within each area. The team implemented these behaviors for the rest of the semester in regard to establishing a more effective teacher of reading. At the end of the semester the behaviors were evaluated by the students on a five point likert scale (0=high, 4-low) according to their needs and how much they received the behavior from each team member
6. What were the results?	We planned to take the results at the end of the semester and rank order the highest 15 within each of the 3 areas according to need. We also planned to indicate behaviors most needed that were not provided by the team members and those behaviors needed that the team member(s) overused.

7. How will we be able to use the information?	At midsemester we used information to develop behaviors for implementation of our definition the rest of the semester. At the end of the semester we evaluated those behaviors we had implemented. We took the top 14-17 in each category to use the next semester to develop more effective teachers of reading. The team also utilized the results for ongoing teacher training at all levels to develop more effective teachers of reading.

Results

Remember, the findings here are based on one team's definition of teachers of reading and one class in a practicum in teaching reading. Based on what they valued, reality, alternatives, information needs, data collection methods, results and utility, this team was able to continue in their ongoing development of what they thought might be a more effective teacher of reading. Assessment procedures consisted of a list of behaviors evolved from the students and team members to which the students reacted on the basis of "need - not need" on a five point likert scale (0=high, 4=low). They also reacted to whether they agreed that these behaviors were being implemented by the teachers on the same scale (agree - disagree). In no way does this generalize to anyone else nor should it. The individual school (principal, teachers, students, parents, and other environmental aspects) is the place for long term innovation and more permanent change. If you can develop what you value, ask yourself the seven questions, figure out procedures for ongoing implementation, evaluate and utilize the results in your setting, you have what we believe to be the impetus for change and the evolvement of more effective ("good") teachers of reading.

Results from Indiana University - One Team

Definition - Teachers of Reading:

1. The teaching/learning process is a deliberate attempt to bring about change in behaviors.

2. An effective teacher is primarily a decision-maker (thinker-question asker) who chooses among many alternatives. Therefore, he/she is a thoughtful, goal-oriented person who is concerned about developing thinking in each student. Hence, the effective teacher becomes a facilitator of the learner's environment by deliberately providing him/her with purposeful, meaningful opportunities to help each become a rational individual - a more effective teacher of reading.

3. The teaching role concerns itself especially with human interaction as it affects the growth and development of teachers by implementing the teaching/learning process for effective learning to take place. It also involves guiding the teacher through enlightening and strengthening his/her knowledge of reading and the teaching of reading, recognizing expertise to be a vital influence in the teaching/learning process.

Three Areas Through Which Behaviors Evolved - reported on the basis of need from highest to lowest in each of three categories. One asterisk placed by a sentence or phrase indicated that a teacher is not providing a student with enough of a needed behavior. A double asterisk indicates overuse of the behavior by the teacher though the behavior is needed.

A. Teaching behaviors that seem to be needed by students who are teaching reading to others are as follows:

1. Willingness to listen to a student's point of view and ability to understand it. (.42)

   Respect for a student both professionally and personally. (.42)

   Use of positive and encouraging evaluations. (.42)

2. Provision for support of a student's endeavors. (.47)

   Ability to put a student at ease during conferences. (.47)

3. Provision for commendation of a student's work at appropriate times. (.52)

   Very encouraging. (.52)

   **Ability to offer constructive criticism about specific tutoring situations. Need (.52) Agree (1.15)

4. *Reflection of a positive attitude. Need (.57) Agree (.20)

   *Allowing a student to approach the teaching situation in his/her own manner. Need (.57) Agree (.42)

   Understanding of my point of view. (.57)

   *Use of tact in getting points across. Need (.57) Agree (.42)

5. Ability to encourage a student to try other procedures if ones have failed. (.61)

   Places me at ease outside of conferences and observations as well as when she/he observes me. (.61)

B. For developing more effective decision makers (thinkers - question askers) in reading among the students a teacher should:

   1. encourage them to be creative and individualistic. (.28)

   2. allow a student to be independent. (.35)

   3. be a 'sounding board' for ideas - listening and offering suggestions if wanted and needed. (.47)

   **4. evaluate a student's lesson plans and make written suggestions. Need (.76) Agree (1.33)

   5. give a student ideas and suggestions after his/her teaching session. (.80)

   **6. evaluate student's lesson plans and make verbal suggestions. Need (.85) Agree (1.04)

   **7. state possible alternatives to achieve objectives. Need (.95) Agree (1.61)

   8. have frequent conferences to help make decisions in a team situation. (1.00)

9. help a student to choose appropriate alternative procedures (1.04)

10. help evaluate a student's outcomes. (1.14)

**11. discuss a student's decision-making with him/her individually Need (1.09) Agree (1.40)

12. frequently observe his/her teaching sessions. (1.19)

13. discuss decision making in a team meeting (1.23)

help him/her in selecting appropriate alternative procedures (1.23)

C. For increasing a student's teaching expertise in the reading process and as a teacher of reading a teacher should:

1. get to know his/her students. (.47)

2. be flexible in his/her own ideas about teaching. (.52)

3. get to know the students being tutored (.57)

4. be flexible in his/her own ideas about reading (.61)

be well organized in his/her own teaching. (.61)

**5. observe a student's teaching. Need (.66) Agree (1.23)

6. **help a student become a keen observer by the teacher being one Need (.71) Agree (1.19)

discuss practical problems in the tutoring sessions. (.71)

7. be well organized in his/her own ideas about reading (.85)

**present new ideas for the student to think about. Need (.85) Agree (1.52)

8. question him or herself in relation to the teaching/learning process (.88)

**9. provide adequate individual conference time weekly. Need (.90) Agree (1.85)

10. direct a student to sources of materials. (.95)

**11. provide adequate group conference time weekly. Need (1.00) Agree (1.47)

12. use a questioning technique that causes a student to evaluate his/her reasoning. (1.14)

The above list of behaviors could be researched further in regard to their independency and use. The list should be modified continuously as a team's or individual's theoretical concepts change. A philosophy will vary with individuals, and with and within one school as well as procedures for implementation. This is good. It is just that one needs to go through the process of identifying values and answering the seven theoretical questions to continue to try to use evaluation to identify "good" teachers of reading. This is only an initial attempt by one team of four teachers and one class of students who were teaching children to read. We sincerely hope you try it.

Bibliography

1. Amidon, E. J. and M. Giammateo. "The Verbal Behavior of Superior Teachers," The Elementary School Journal, Volume 65 (February 1965), 283-285.

2. Artley, A. Sterl. "The Teacher Variable in the Teaching of Reading," The Reading Teacher, Volume 23, Number 3, December, 1969, pp. 239-248. Also delivered as a Distinguished Leaders Address at the International Reading Association Convention, Kansas City, Kansas, 1969.

3. Bond, G. L. and R. Dykstra. "The Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading," Reading Research Quarterly, Volume 2, Summer, 1967, entire issue.

4. Cass, James (education editor) "An Environment for Creative Teachers," Saturday Review/World, April 7, 1974, p. 51.

5. Della-Piana, Gabriel M. and George T. Endo. "Reading Research," Chapter 28 in Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (Robert M. W. Travers, editor). A project of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973, pp. 883-925.

6. Denemark, George W. and Joost Yff. Obligation for Reform. Final Report of the Higher Education Task Force on Improvement and Reform in American Education. AACTE, One Dupont Circle. Washington, D. C. 20036. January, 1974.

7. Flanders, N. A. Teacher Influence: Pupil Attitudes and Achievement, Final Report, 1960. University of Minnesota: Project 397. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Program, Office of Education.

8. Goodlad, John I. The Power of Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator, Volume 1, New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

9. Goodlad, John I. Individualization: The Way to Do It. Volume 2, New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

10. Griffin, Margaret M. and Paula J. Brousseau. Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs in Reading, Paper presented in a Symposium by the authors, College Reading Association, Seventeenth Annual Convention, Silver Spring, Maryland, November 3, 1973.

11. Harris, A. J. and C. Morrison, "The CRAFT Project: A Final Report," The Reading Teacher, Volume 22, (January 1969), 335-40.

12. Ramsey, W. S. "An Evaluation of Three Methods of Teaching Reading," in Figurel, (Ed.) Challenge and Experiment in Reading, International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Volume 7, 1962. p. 153.

13. Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Eudcation, 1960.

14. Stufflebeam, Daniel L. et al. Education Evaluation and Decision Making, Itasca, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

15. Travers, Robert M. W. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. A Project of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973.

16. Turner, Richard L. "An Overview of Research in Teacher Education," Forum, 300 Education Building, Indiana University, Volume 2, Number 4, December, 1973. To be published in the new NSSE Yearbook, 1974.

17. Turner, Richard L. The Acquisition of Teaching Skills in Elementary School Settings, Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, June, 1965.